REMARKS

Claims 1-10, and 12-23 are pending. Of these, claims 16-21 are withdrawn and claims 1-9 are allowed.

Applicants thank Examiner Hines for the indication on page 5 of the Office Action that claims 1-9 are allowed.

For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 10, 12, 13, 15, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cok (U.S. Patent No. 6,831,407). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Cok fails to disclose or suggest an organic electroluminescent display device comprising an upper electrode formed on the pixel define layer and the organic thin film layers, wherein the upper surface of each of the pixel define layers is substantially coplanar with or lower than the upper surfaces of the corresponding adjacent lower electrodes due to the corresponding buffer pattern, as recited in claim 10.

Also, Cok fails to disclose or suggest an organic electroluminescent display, comprising a substantially planar first electrode formed to a first height above the substrate, and a pixel define layer formed to a second height above the substrate to define the first electrode within a corresponding pixel without covering a portion of the first electrode, wherein the first height is substantially the same as or greater than the second height, as called for in claim 22.

Contrary to the assertion is the Office Action, Cok fails to disclose or suggest the pixel define layer as recited in claims 10 and 22 because FIG. 8 of Cok fails to disclose a pixel define layer at all. Instead, FIG. 8 of Cok simply discloses an insulating layer 24 formed over the thin film transistor (TFT), a first electrode 16 formed over the insulating layer 24, an organic layer 12 formed over the first electrode 16, and a second electrode 14 formed over the organic layer 12 (see, for example, col. 5, lines 45-51, and FIG. 8 of Cok). Such fails to disclose or suggest that the upper surface of each of the pixel define layers is substantially coplanar with or lower than the upper surfaces of the corresponding adjacent lower electrodes, as recited in claim 10, or that

the first height (of the first electrode) is substantially the same as or greater than the second height (of the pixel define layer), as called for in claim 22.

In FIG. 7, Cok discloses that the first electrode 16 is separated by insulators or simply by a gap (see, for example, col. 5, lines 25 and 26, and FIG. 7 of Cok). The lack of any cross hatching for the area between the first electrodes 16 would indicated a gap existing in between the first electrodes 16. Such fails to disclose or suggest that the upper surface of each of the pixel define layers is substantially coplanar with or lower than the upper surfaces of the corresponding adjacent lower electrodes, as recited in claim 10, or that the first height (of the first electrode) is substantially the same as or greater than the second height (of the pixel define layer), as called for in claim 22.

As a prior art, Cok discloses the structure of FIG. 2 having a patterned second insulating layer 24' provided over the array of first electrodes 16 such that at least a portion of the each of the first electrode is exposed (see, for example, col. 3, lines 6-9, and FIG. 2 of Cok). However, the second insulating layer 24' is formed on the patterned first insulating layer 24 in FIG. 2 of Cok so as to have the surface thereof be higher than that of the first electrode 16. Such fails to disclose or suggest that the upper surface of each of the pixel define layers is substantially coplanar with or lower than the upper surfaces of the corresponding adjacent lower electrodes, as recited in claim 10, or that the first height (of the first electrode) is substantially the same as or greater than the second height (of the pixel define layer), as called for in claim 22. Instead, in Cok, the second insulating layer 24' is higher.

Accordingly, because Cok either lacks a pixel define layer, or discloses only a second insulating layer 24' or an insulating layer 24 that does not meet the claimed features, claims 10 and 22 are patentably distinguishable over the applied reference to Cok. Claims 10-13 and 15, which depend from claim 10, and claim 23, which depend from claim 22, are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied reference to Cok for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

On page 4 of the Office Action, claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok, in view of Fujita et al. (U.S. Patent 6,758,538). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Cok fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, from which claim 14 depend. Fujita fails to overcome the above noted deficiencies of Cok. Accordingly, claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

On page 5, claims 1 - 9 are indicated as allowed.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: May 25, 2007

By: _____
James G. McEwen
Registration No. 41,983

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510